



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

31

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/717,042	09/20/1996	IGOR PALLEY	30-3744CIP	6496

7590 02/19/2004

VIRGINIA S. ANDREWS  
ALLIEDSIGNAL INC  
LAW DEPARTMENT  
P O BOX 31  
PETERSBURG, VA 23804

EXAMINER
----------

ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

SW

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/717,042	09/20/1996	IGOR PALLEY	30-3744CIP	6496

7590 01/29/2004

VIRGINIA S. ANDREWS  
ALLIEDSIGNAL INC  
LAW DEPARTMENT  
P O BOX 31  
PETERSBURG, VA 23804

EXAMINER

ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3727

RECEIVED

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

FEB 12 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*remailed  
2/19/04*

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/717,042

Applicant(s)

PALLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Niki M. Eloshway

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-47 and 51-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-47 and 51-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: ATT. 1

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Introduction*

1. This Action was necessitated by the newly presented argument regarding claims 21, 22 and 24, set forth in the Appeal Brief filed November 5, 2003.

### *Election/Restriction*

2. Claims 12, 48-50 and 54-66 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected species. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 11.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 20-28, 30, 47, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks (U.S. 5,249,534) in view of MacDonald et al. (U.S. 3,822,807). Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material. MacDonald et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the foam of MacDonald et al., in order to prevent a rise in pressure within the container.

Art Unit: 3727

Sacks teaches a container set forth in col. 1 line 43 through col. 2 line 23. The bands of Sacks can be made of SPECTRA, as set forth in col. 1 lines 33-42. This SPECTRA material is the same material used in applicant's invention, and therefore has the same characteristics.

Regarding claims 21, 22 and 24, Applicant states in the Appeal Brief filed November 5, 2003 that at the time of the Sacks invention the "SPECTRA SHIELD material would have been characterized by a maximum of 50 percent of its continuous fiber lengths running in one direction - the balance would have been at approximately a 90° angle to the direction of these fiber lengths." Evidence has not been presented by Applicant to defend such a statement.

5. Claims 10, 11, 13-19, 33-43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks (U.S. 5,249,534) in view of MacDonald et al. (U.S. 3,822,807) and Lewis (U.S. 0,674,009). Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material and except for the strips of material forming bands. MacDonald et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the foam of MacDonald et al., in order to prevent a rise in pressure within the container.

Lewis teaches that it is known to provide a container, made of three bands, wherein the first and second bands form tubes (see elements B and C). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified container of Sacks with the first and second strips forming bands, as taught by Lewis, in order to protect the entire inner container, including the bottom wall thereof.

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 27, 29, 31, 47 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Gettle et al. Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material. Gettle et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with aqueous foam (see line 11 of the Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 3727

the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the aqueous foam of Gettle et al., in order to attenuate pressure waves.

7. Claims 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks (U.S. 5,249,534) in view of MacDonald et al. (U.S. 3,822,807), as applied to claim 20, and further in view of Harpell et al. (U.S. 4,623,574). To the degree that applicant argues that the SPECTRA material used by Sacks did not have at least 75 percent of its fibers substantially continuous. Harpell et al. teaches that it is known to provide a material wherein the fibers are wound around an article. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified container of Sacks with at least 75 percent of the fibers being substantially continuous, in order to increase the strength of the band.

8. Claims 32, 33, 35, 38, 42, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Gettle et al. and Lewis. Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material and except for the strips of material being bands. Gettle et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with aqueous foam (see line 11 of the Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the aqueous foam of Gettle et al., in order to attenuate pressure waves.

Lewis teaches that it is known to provide a container, made of three bands, wherein the first and second bands form tubes (see elements B and C). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified container of Sacks with the first and second strips forming bands, as taught by Lewis, in order to protect the entire inner container, including the bottom wall thereof.

*Response to Arguments*

9. Applicant's arguments filed November 5, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 20-28, 30, 47, 51 and 52

Applicant argues that Sacks "fails to teach a collapsible container or a container of blast resistant material" (page 6 of Appeal Brief, filed November 5, 2003). It is the examiner's position that that the cover of Sacks meets the limitations of the collapsible container set forth in the claims. A container is defined in Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1990) as "one that contains; *esp* : a receptacle or a flexible covering for the shipment of goods" (see Attachment 1). The cover of Sacks contains the rigid container and it is a flexible covering for the shipment of goods. This cover of Sacks is made from "high tensile strength, high stretch resistant flexible material", as described on page 6 of the Appeal Brief filed November 5, 2003. This material allows the cover to be considered collapsible, as set forth in the pending claims.

Regarding claims 21, 22 and 24, Applicant argues that Sacks does not teach or suggest that at least about 75 weight percent of the fibers are continuous lengths of fiber that encircle the enclosed volume. In col. 1 line 65 through col. 2 line 7, Sacks sets forth a cover comprised of three panels of material. The third panel is wound around the enclosed volume and has its ends connected together. This third panel encircles the volume by forming a closed loop or closed band of material. Sacks teaches the use of woven and non-woven fabric, such as SPECTRA and SPECTRASHIELD (col. 1 lines 37-39).

Applicant argues that "SPECTRA SHIELD material would have been characterized by a maximum of 50 percent of its continuous fiber lengths running in one direction - the balance would have been at approximately a 90° angle to the direction of these fiber lengths" (page 6 of the Appeal Brief filed November 5, 2003) at the time of the Sacks invention. The patent of Harpell et al. (U.S.

Art Unit: 3727

4,623,574) teaches that it was known by 1986 that layers of fibers could be arranged to extend in parallel direction. Harpell et al. also teaches that continuous lengths of yarn could be wrapped around an article.

Regarding the McDonald reference, Applicants argue that the foam balls of MacDonald et al. “will not make the standard container disclosed by Sacks effective to withstand a blast” (page 7 of Appeal Brief filed November 5, 2003). The examiner disagrees with this position. The foam balls of MacDonald would aid in reducing or mitigating the effects of a blast, to the degree set forth in the claims. Applicant sets forth that Example 11 of the present application prevents fire, and that Examples 12-16 provide protection against explosive charges weighting two to four times that which can be container without foam. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 47, 51 and 52, Applicant argues that the claimed container has two open sides. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Claim 47 is an open claim which sets forth a band of material. It does not set forth that the container is open on two sides. Sacks teaches a band of material in col. 2 lines 4-7. It is unclear why the cover of Sacks is not considered a container by Applicants but the band of material can be considered a container by Applicants.

B. Claims 10-11, 13-19, 33-43 and 45

Applicant argues that the panels of Sacks are not bands. The examiner disagrees with this position. Sacks teaches a third panel which encircles the volume and has its ends connected together



Art Unit: 3727

(col. 2 lines 4-7). In addition, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). These claims are rejected over Sacks as modified by MacDonald and Lewis. The reference of Lewis teaches a container formed by three thin, flat, volume-encircling strips or bands. The first and second panels of Sacks are modified by the structure of the panels of Lewis, such that the first and second panels of Sacks become volume-encircling. Furthermore, it should be noted that applicants have not set forth in the claims or in the definition of band that the bands must be a closed loop.

C. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 27, 29, 31, 47 and 53

Regarding the Gettle et al. reference, Applicant sets forth that Example 11 of the present application prevents fire, and that Examples 12-16 provide protection against explosive charges weighting two to four times that which can be container without foam. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

D. Claims 32-33, 35, 38, 42, 44 and 46

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).


Art Unit: 3727

*Conclusion*


10. In view of the new grounds of rejection for claims 21, 22 and 24, which was necessitated by the newly presented argument regarding the SPECTRA Fibers, **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.**

11. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly to (703)872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a USPTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niki M. Eloshway whose telephone number is (703) 308-1606. The examiner is in the office on Tuesdays and Fridays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-5648.



Niki M. Eloshway/nme  
Patent Examiner  
January 23, 2004



LEE YOUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700